REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has not been amended and no claims have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 1, 5-8, 11-13 and 17-20 are pending and under consideration.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5-8, 11-13 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Gomes, U.S. Patent No. 6,615,209. Gomes is directed to a method of reducing the amount of data viewed(indexed) in a internet search engine query by detecting duplicate content. This in contrast to the present claims that are directed to a method of accessing "bookmarks" stored in a web server. Bookmarks are returned to the client in an HTML page, the content of the page based on the IP address of the client. Gomes, column 15 lines 45-61 states:

> First, as indicated by communication 1405, a search process 830' receives a query from a client user interface process 716'. In this example, **the query is "muppet faq"**. (Referring to FIG. 7, the (entire) browsing process 712, the (client) input/output interface process(es) 718, the network 760, the (search engine) input/output interface process(es) 732, and the (entire) query processing process 734 are not shown in FIG. 14, to simplify the drawing.) The **search process 830' generates results in the normal manner and saves them as rank-ordered results**, as indicated by communication 1410. FIG. 15 illustrates these results as they could be rendered to the client user. In accordance with the present invention, however, these ranked results are merely candidate results CR.sub.1, CR.sub.2, . . . , CR.sub.10. The **search process 830' then calls the duplicate removal management process** 930 as indicated by communication 1415. [Emphasis added]

Thus, what is discussed in Gomes is the internet search/query for "muppet faq", the production of a results list, then a reduction for duplicate content. In Gomes, therefore what is received is a search string. In contrast to the present claims, what the receiving module receives is an IP address of the client("access site information'). The string "muppet faq" can not be access site information as it does not contain "information on the location of an access site through which said client accesses said network," as in claim 1. Therefore, Gomes as cited or found does not teach or suggest "a receiving module receiving, from said client, a providing request for the information, the providing request containing a piece of access site information containing information on the location of an access site through which said client accesses said network, wherein said client has a plurality of access sites and accesses said network through a selected access site among said plurality of access sites," as in claim 1.

Further, as Gomes is retrieving data based on the referenced pages containing a string such as "muppet faq", it does not retrieve data based upon "access site information." (IP Address) Therefore, Gomes does not disclose "a URL management module extracting the piece of access site information from the providing request, retrieving URLs corresponding to the piece of access site information from a database, retrieving titles corresponding to the retrieved URLs from the database, and generating a document containing the retrieved URLs and the retrieved titles, wherein the database stores different URLs according to each piece of access site information," as in claim 1.

Additionally as Gomes is searching for text, the IP address of the client("access site information") does not effect the data returned to the client. Therefore, Gomes does not disclose "a transmitting module transmitting the generated document to said client, wherein said URL information is registered into the database in advance of the providing request by a user of said client, whereby said client obtains a different document according to said selected access site," as in claim 1.

Claims 8, 12 and 13 each use "access site information" for producing or storing the URLs of the present claims. For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1, 8, 12 and 13 and claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinguishable from Gomes.

As per claim 6, nothing in Gomes as cited discusses the "access site information" is the source address of the client. Therefore, Gomes does not disclose "wherein the access site information is a source address of the providing request," as in claim 6.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM

Claim 21 is new. The prior art failing to teach or suggest a "request including the network address of the client." As discussed above, the IP address of the client is not part of the request in Gomes.

SUMMARY

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 20, 2007   By: /James J. Livingston, Jr./
                                          James J. Livingston, Jr.
                                          Registration No. 55,394

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501